

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-15 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 11, and 14 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 11, and 14 are sought to be amended to better recite features of the claims. Support for these changes can be found throughout the specification, including inter alia at Paragraphs 0006, 0008, 0016, and 0024 of the written description and in FIGs. 1 and 3 of the drawings. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 6-8, 14, and 15 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, as allegedly not being enabled. Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to claim 6, the Examiner argues that “‘an auxiliary pad coupled to said fuse corner pad’ is not enabled because the specification and the figure describe each auxiliary pad coupled to said fuse corner pad.” (Paper No. No. 05272005, page 2). The rationale for the Examiner’s rejection is unclear, and/or the Examiner is reading limitations into the claim that are not supported by the language of the claim. The

specification (including Paragraphs 0016, 0018 and 0019, and FIG. 1) describes an embodiment that includes a plurality of auxiliary pads 104a-104n coupled to fuse corner pad 100. The specification further describes that the total quantity of auxiliary pads 104a-104n can be increased or decreased as determined by the system designer. Moreover, the open-ended transitional phrase “comprising” does not restrict “an auxiliary pad” to being only one auxiliary pad. Additionally, the “coupled to” language shows the interrelationship among the auxiliary pad and the fuse corner pad. Therefore, Applicants consider the recited language of claim 6 to be supported by the specification.

With respect to claim 14, the Examiner argues that “‘wherein said fuse corner pad includes a plurality of fuse contacts coupled to said fuse corner pad’ is not enabled because the specification and the figure describe each fuse contact coupled to each fuse corner pad.” Paper No. No. 05272005, page 2. The Examiner’s rationale for this rejection is also unclear, and/or the Examiner is reading limitations into the claim that are not supported by the language of the claim. The specification (including Paragraphs 0016, 0018 and 0019, and FIG. 1) describes an embodiment that includes a plurality of fuse contacts 102 coupled to fuse corner pad 100, and an embodiment that includes one or more of the auxiliary pads 104a-104n being an additional fuse contact(s) 102. The specification further describes that the total quantity of fuse contacts 102 can be increased or decreased as determined by the system designer. Additionally, the “coupled to” language shows the interrelationship among the fuse contacts and the fuse corner pad. Therefore, Applicants consider the recited language of claim 14 to be supported by the specification.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claims 6, and claim 15 depends from claim 14. Applicants assume that claims 7, 8, and 15 have been rejected for depending from a rejected base claim (i.e., claims 6 and 14) since the Examiner has provided no other reasoning for rejecting these claims. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are likewise enabled by the specification for the reasons stated above with respect to claims 6 and 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6-8, 14, and 15, and allowance thereof.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, and 4-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,348,742 to MacPherson (herein referred to as “MacPherson”). (Paper No. No. 05272005, page 3).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s rejection, this rejection is moot in light of the above amendment. Independent claims 1, 11, and 14 have been amended to recite wherein said fuse corner pad is incapable of being bonded to an external electrical connection. Even if MacPherson teaches a fuse corner pad (which Applicants do not concede), MacPherson does not teach a fuse pad that is incapable of being bonded to an external electrical connection.

On the contrary, MacPherson describes a “bond pad” that is bonded to wires to create an electrically conductive pathway between package pins and the device upon which the bond pad is formed. (See MacPherson at col. 4, lines 52-55). Therefore, MacPherson’s “bond” pad is electrically connected to an external contact. (See

MacPherson at col. 6, lines 40-41). As such, MacPherson does not teach each and every element, feature, and/or limitation of Applicants' claims 1, 11, and 14.

Claims 2 and 4-10 depend from claim 1; claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11; and claim 15 depend from claim 14. These dependent claims are patentable over MacPherson for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1, 11, and 14, in addition to the features cited therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 4-15, and allowance thereof.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as allegedly being unpatentable over MacPherson. (Paper No. No. 05272005, page 6).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection, this rejection is moot in light of the above amendment. Claim 3 depends from claim 2, which depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over MacPherson for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 3, in addition to the features cited therein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3, and allowance thereof.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Kendrick P. Patterson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,321

Date: September 1, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

410218_1.DOC